

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are pending in the present application. Claims 5-7, 10, 15-17, 20, 22 and 24-27 are objected to. In the March 26, 2007 Final Office Action, the Examiner renewed rejections made in a June 19, 2006 Non-Final Office Action. In the June 19, 2006 Non-Final Office Action, the Examiner:

1. Rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 18, 19, and 21 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,300,837 to Sowlati; and
2. Rejected claims 2, 12, and 23 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sowlati.

Applicants respectfully traverse.

I. REJECTIONS BASED ON APPLICATION OF SOWLATI

On December 19, 2006, Applicants responded to the rejections made by the Examiner in the June 19, 2006 Non-Final Office Action. In the pending Final Office Action, the Examiner stated:

Applicant's arguments filed on December 19, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued that Sowlati does not teach "in complete detail" as is contained in the ... claim". Applicant further stated that the bias current is described as being the "voltage at the 4.7 kilo-ohm resistor 120 divided by the resistance value (4.7 kilo-ohms)," where the voltage at the resistor 120 is equal to the divided bias voltage at the negative input terminal of op-amp 110. (Page 5, lines 4-7). However, the claimed invention does not show in complete detail the subject matters disclosed on page 2, lines 4-7. Note, you read the claims in light of the specification. But you do not incorporate the limitation in the specification into the claims. We only give patentable weight to the limitations positively recited in the claims. We absolutely don't give patentable weight to the limitations recited in the specification but not positively recited in the claims. Therefore, claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11-14, 18, 19, 21, 23 remain rejected.

See March 26, 2007 Final Office Action, pg. 2.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims do in fact recite the claimed subject matter in more than sufficient detail to distinguish over Sowlati. Referring to Independent claim 1 as an example, the claim recites “a *constant* current bias circuit,” which is sufficient to distinguish over the *dynamic* current source taught by Sowlati. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has used the quote to the specification out of context. Applicants quoted the specification as support for the claim language that recites a *constant* current source.

Nevertheless, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 5 and 10 to further clarify that the bias current recited in claim 1 is *constant*. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the amendment because the claim already recites a constant bias current circuit. All searches conducted by the Examiner should have been more than broad enough to encompass the amended claim since the claim scope has not changed as a result of the amendment. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-10, which are dependent on claim 1, independent claims 11 and 21, and dependent claims 12-20 and 22-27 are also allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

Favorable consideration is respectfully requested in view of the following amendments and remarks.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-2542. A copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 5/29/07

By: _____



Enrique Perez
The Eclipse Group LLP
10605 Balboa Blvd., Suite 300
Granada Hills, CA 91344
(818) 488-8141 Telephone
(818) 332-4205 Fax
ep@eclipsegrp.com

Customer No.: **34408**